Washington State Department of Transportation

SoundTransit

MEETING SUMMARY
SR-520/TRANS-LAKE WASHINGTON PROJECT
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
OVERLAKE CONFERENCE CENTER, BELLEVUE
APRIL 10, 2002 — 9:00 A.M. – 2:00 P.M.

The Technical Committee of the Trans-Lake Washington Project met on April 10, 2002 at the Overlake Conference Center in Bellevue, WA. Discussion focused on proposed methodologies for preparing the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) and proposed transportation demand management (TDM) program components. All input received will be provided to the Advisory and Executive Committees. Technical Committee members not present on April 10 are encouraged to provide specific feedback to the project team as soon as possible so that it can be included in the material provided to the other committees. Please send EIS methodology feedback to Lorie Parker, CH2M Hill, by April 24, 2002.

EIS METHODOLOGY DISCUSSION

Lorie Parker, CH2M Hill, described the EIS methodology format and the overall intent of the analysis. Lorie emphasized that it was important for the resource agencies to provide guidance and input at the preliminary stage of the process, since the agencies will have to approve the preferred alternative. The EIS project team has drafted the methodologies to include explanations of analysis methodology and specific contact information in each section, in case there are questions. Lead agency environmental representatives Paul Krueger, WSDOT, and Steve Kennedy, Sound Transit, spent time with the EIS project team providing input on the draft EIS Methodology Report.

The Trans-Lake Washington project is completing a project-level EIS. Complete engineering detail is not ready at this time, although it will be available further in the process. At this point, construction impacts will be assessed at a programmatic level, and certain impacts described qualitatively. The draft EIS Methodology Report includes all the sections except for the cumulative and indirect impact analyses. The project team will have the preliminary cumulative and indirect impact sections ready for committee review during the next Technical Committee meeting. Lorie asked the group to provide big picture, substantive corrections rather than grammatical edits at this time and to provide markups at the end of the meeting session.

Each element of the environment that will be described in its own section is listed on page 2 of the *Trans-Lake Washington Project EIS Methodology Report – DRAFT 4/3/02.* Page 3 describes the accompanying work to be done as appendices or related documents. To avoid repetition, the fisheries, vegetation and wildlife, wetlands, and threatened and endangered species environmental elements were combined into one section, entitled *Ecosystems*. A map folio relying heavily on geographic information systems (GIS) maps will be done to shorten the written description and help describe the impacts visually. Accompanying work will include an

environmental justice appendix, a navigational studies section and a chapter on Section 4(f)/6(f) resource evaluation. The navigational studies chapter will aid the Coast Guard with permitting bridges for water navigation purposes. Section 4(f)/6(f) resource evaluation is required for a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) EIS. Lorie stated that she would take the committee's comments and list the substantive ones in a matrix, and then explain how each comment was dealt with in the revised EIS Methodology.

Wetlands, Vegetation and Wildlife, Water Resources, and Fisheries

Margaret Clancy, Parametrix, represented the wetlands section, as well as the vegetation and wildlife impact methodology section. The study area for the wetlands analysis will be 100 feet from both sides of the edge of the pavement. The project team will do fieldwork using global positioning systems (GPS) to better identify the wetlands area, and they will include this work on the mapping analysis. The full wetland delineation will come later with permitting. Vegetation and wildlife will be studied a half mile from the edge of pavement of the proposed alternatives. For the vegetation and wildlife impact methodology section, the study area will be a half mile from the proposed edge and one mile for the nesting bald eagles population. They will use data from agencies, aerial photos, and field reconnaissance for this analysis.

Jenna Friebel, Parametrix, is the contact for the water resources impact methodology section. The water resources study area will include the SR 520 corridor, sub-watersheds, and identified receiving waters. The surface water analysis will consist of existing data and field investigations. Groundwater analysis will not include any additional fieldwork. The project will refresh GIS data and bring in new resources. The stormwater design has been discussed with agencies, and design will be completed at a later date.

Don Weitkamp, Parametrix, represented the fisheries section of the EIS impact methodology. The fisheries study area will include Lake Washington, the Ship Canal, Kelsey Creek and tributaries, Yarrow Creek, Sammamish River, and Bear Creek. Field reconnaissance will be done to supplement and update existing data.

The following questions and points were brought up at this time:

- Peter Beaulieu, Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), asked whether the Trans-Lake EIS project team has worked directly with the I-405 project team to obtain lessons learned and analyses previously done on air quality and other areas, in order to apply them to the Trans-Lake Washington project environmental analysis. Terry Swanson, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), again urged that the project team talk to the I-405 project team (Christina, Bruce Smith, etc.). The I-405 project will have lessons learned on early mitigation and the resource mitigation plan.
- Peter Beaulieu, PSRC, pointed out that the I-405 project has some of the same geographic area as the Trans-Lake Washington project, and that may be useful for the watershed framework. Connecting the corridor-wide programs would be effective and would assist

with completing analysis on cumulative impacts. He would like mitigation problems identified and efforts done before construction.

- Sarah Suggs Ecology, recommended that the wetlands study area be 200 feet on each side to accommodate local jurisdiction requirements. She noted that the Shoreline Management Act (SMA) and higher quality wetlands and critical area ordinances in many jurisdictions require 100-foot buffers. Margaret Clancy noted that the study area would be 100 feet from cement and that they plan on accommodating shoreline issues for the Lake Washington and Lake Sammamish areas.
- Jim Leonard, Federal Highway Administration, asked whether the environmental procedures would be done according to WSDOT procedures. Lorie explained that they are using the new WSDOT Environmental Procedures Manual as the bases for the methodologies.
- Terry Swanson, Ecology, requested that the EIS methodology format call out the shoreline issues in the Shoreline Management Act to avoid confusion with wetland issues.
- Len Newstrum, Town of Yarrow Point, reiterated his previously sent comment on the definition of accommodating HCT right-of-way for SR-520. Len is concerned that 10-15 years from now the commitment to reserve a HCT right-of-way will dissolve. He requested a detailed definition of the right-of-way from each edge and asked that money be spent to include this definition. Lorie Parker pointed out that the project team is creating a project description which will be the basis for the environmental analyses and this description should include the HCT right-of-way definition. The team will have a follow up session to discuss this further. Jeff Peacock, Parametrix, noted that they are not preserving right-of-way for HCT with this project. The project team plans on laying out the structures to accommodate HCT construction and they will have a variety of scenarios on how HCT might be accommodated to share with the Trans-Lake Washington project committees.
- Mike Grady, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), asked whether each alternative includes a light rail component. Lorie Parker clarified that the Executive Committee recommended putting light rail on I-90 and not on SR-520, so they are no longer considering light rail in the SR-520 Corridor.
- Ann Martin, King County, would like consistency between the I-405 project and the Trans-Lake Washington project. There are differences in the project environmental elements, and the Trans-Lake project EIS methodology does not include the I-405 project water resource inventory areas. She asked about the methodology for mitigation, pointing out that some pieces, such as lids, would have their own environmental impacts. Ann also questioned whether the study area, including the edge of the pavement, would be sufficient. Lorie Parker replied that they would have indirect impact methodologies at a later date. She noted that lidding will be included in the project description and the air quality and noise impacts related to lidding will also be analyzed. The project team will have approximate cut and fill lines on which to base the environmental analysis.
- Jonathan Freedman, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), asked how the indirect and cumulative effects would be integrated in the EIS methodologies,

particularly for the ecosystems section. He also asked if the indirect and direct effects will appear in separate documents. Jonathan discussed the difficulties with organizing indirect and direct effects by resources and on commenting on an incomplete document. He requested that the EIS impact methodology include indirect hydrological impacts, such as the impacts of altering the water table geography. Lorie Parker pointed out that the cumulative impacts will be in a separate document, and they will share the indirect impact analysis during the next Technical Committee meeting.

- Emily Teachout, US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), requested separate discussion on indirect impacts with the project team and agencies. She asked if the indirect effects, under the water resources section, would be based on literature review and not on modeling. Lorie Parker said that they would use modeling along with literature for the water resources section. Emily reiterated her previously sent comments and suggested, on behalf of USFWS, that the impact methodologies for stormwater issues look more outside the box by addressing mitigation approaches and functions, such as showing reductions in base flow. Emily requested that the fisheries section and analysis focus on functions, illustrating surface water and temperature impacts. She suggested analysis and mitigation be driven by functions in the wetlands section.
- Les Rubstello, WSDOT, pointed out that if the statewide ballot passes, the project will get $100 million for the next three years. With that funding, the DEIS will be published in October 2003. Without funding, the DEIS will be published in April 2004. The project's design year is 2030.
- Len Newstrum, Town of Yarrow Point, pointed out that the transportation section in the EIS methodology would apply to the other sections. He pointed out that the mitigation for the preferred alternative would be a major component on deciding the outcome.
- Bernard van de Kamp, City of Bellevue, requested information on impact assessment for traffic. He specifically would like the borders identified for the wetland investigation and mainline improvements for local streets analysis. Lorie Parker again pointed out that the area of impact analysis would be derived from the project description. He asked how the EIS methodologies GIS mapping organization would be done. Lorie Parker explained that the mapping analysis will match potential phases and break points. Lorie plans on sharing the mapping organization with the Technical Committee in the future.
- Jonathan Freedman, EPA, asked whether the project team will have to do a separate analysis for each agency in order to have the agencies sign off on the DEIS. Jonathan noted that the I-405 project deferred analysis at the project-specific level to respond to agency information requests. Lorie Parker responded that the project team does not have enough funding to build separate analyses for each permit. Les Rubstello would like permitting problems clarified to avoid deferring impacts for a later document. Jonathan questioned whether they will need to have global positioning systems (GPS) and whether ten years from now the data will be outdated. Les explained that the project would have the roadway configuration and engineering for the project area precisely identified. If funding problems discontinue the project, WSDOT will come back later to continue analysis. The Trans-Lake Washington project will be more precise than the I-405

project. The project team will show impacts to wetlands based on field collected data and if the project is delayed at least three years they will have to reevaluate the EIS.

- Mike Grady, NMFS, noted the potential problems involved with double counting mitigation sites at a watershed level scale for the wetland analysis. Mike asked who will keep track of the checkbook and whether there will be a master watershed map. He asked that they include the tribes for review of the fisheries section, and that the fish data be included. Don Weitkamp, Parametrix, stated that they would be doing fieldwork for the streams and habitat.
- Ann Martin, King County, expressed concerned over the shelf life of information, since this may be a long process. She asked if there would be discussion on phasing of implementation, as done in the I-405 project. She recommended considering the fact that the EIS may be delayed for more than ten years. Les Rubstello, WSDOT, stated that the EIS phasing has not been studied, and that a delay would affect the project. Les said that the project team may be able to identify a phase that would be built first, but they do not plan on phasing the analysis.

Air Quality

Mary Beth Yansura, CH2M Hill, will conduct the air quality analysis. Lorie Parker discussed Richard Conlin's motion, requesting that the analysis baseline include neighborhoods not affected by SR-520 traffic. Discussions are continuing on how his interests might be addressed, as that is not part of the accepted methodology. The air quality study area will include the SR-520 corridor and the sensitive receptors within a quarter mile of proposed alternatives. The project team will be using existing air quality monitoring station data. The air quality data will be dependant on traffic levels. They will monitor and model the existing conditions, to help illustrate the air quality impacts.

Discussion yielded the following points and questions:

- Paul Carr, Puget Sound Clean Air Agency, noted concern over the cumulative impacts of the major transportation projects (such as the Alaskan Way Viaduct and the I-405 projects) and how they would affect quantifying airsheds. He suggested that the Trans-Lake Washington project coordinate with the I-405 project at a corridor level. He reiterated that conformity is a ceiling; complying with NEPA/SEPA air regulations would be costly. Paul requested that the project seek more information on air quality, especially particulates. He would like to see quantitative analysis for the air quality section.
- Peter Beaulieu, PSRC, asked to have accurate modeling of air quality in order for all the projects to coordinate air quality analysis. This will be required for the Council to sign an EIS Record of Decision (ROD).
- Ann Martin, King County, voiced her discomfort over several major transportation projects needing funding and the lack of available resources. She is concerned about testing only the resulting preferred alternative and wondered whether they will achieve

air quality goals. She asked if there will be a mid-point air quality analysis and whether a methodology will be made available.

- Paul Carr, Puget Sound Clean Air Agency, stated that the guidance of the 2030 design year normally would require consultation for determining how to analyze the year of peak occurrence. He questioned that with only two consultation meetings this year, how will the project team have enough time before EIS completion to deal with major impacts and current regulations in a collaborative process. He noted that there are bigger picture issues that the state has not addressed. He expressed optimism that the project will have a workable solution that will satisfy all agencies.
- Mitch Wasserman, City of Clyde Hill, requested information on the proximity of existing monitoring stations. He questioned how he will explain the impacts and benefits to his community after EIS publication. He asked why the project will not supplement additional air monitoring locations. Lorie Parker stated that the nearest air quality monitoring to the Points communities is located in Bellevue. The project team will examine intersection areas, complete monitoring analysis under future conditions, and look at project build conditions as an improvement over no-build. Lorie continued, saying that carbon monoxide has not been identified as a potential impact for the Clyde Hill area, which is why they do not plan to have a monitoring station in Clyde Hill. Mitch asked how the project would analyze tolls. Jeff Peacock, Parametrix, reported that the project would be conducting a management feasibility study, which examines traffic mobility opportunities, pricing, and potential air quality benefits.
- Doug Schultz, City of Medina, expressed concern over the lack of air monitoring stations in the Points communities. The City of Medina has air monitors at the Fairweather Preserve and near the pedestrian bridge at the Bellevue Christian School. The City has registered some carbon monoxide peaks and he fears that with greater SR-520 capacity from an expansion, air quality will decrease in the City of Medina. He questioned how the area between the stations will be analyzed.
- Ann Martin, King County, noted that Richard Conlin's (City of Seattle Councilmember) request says that the project should look at non-affected neighborhoods. Lorie Parker, CH2M Hill, replied that legally they would have to look at the affected environment.
- Paul Carr, Puget Sound Clean Air Agency, stated that he would provide the I-405 project air quality analysis for the Trans-Lake Washington project.

Noise

Michael Minor, Minor and Associates, will be directing the noise analysis for the Trans-Lake Washington project. He will be using the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)/Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) noise impact criteria for the noise section in the impact analysis. The study area will be 500 feet from the proposed alternatives and five feet off the ground or fifteen feet off the ground for second story outdoor uses. Detailed field reconnaissance will be completed to identify all noise sensitive receptors and a supplemental analysis.

The following questions and points were discussed for the noise section of the EIS methodology:

- Jennifer Bowman, Federal Transit Administration (FTA), asked whether the detailed report would use the FTA approach (for noise) or include a description explaining why they are not using these regulations. Michael Minor, Minor and Associates, stated that the project will not be using the FTA regulations, but they will be using WSDOT environmental regulations. A report will be available in two weeks with information on regulations/approaches and a comparison of criteria and methodology. This report will be a part of the EIS appendices.
- Len Newstrum, Town of Yarrow Point, questioned how bus traffic noise would be analyzed. Michael Minor explained that the noise modeling will be based on many vehicle types, such as minivans, United Postal Services vehicles, heavy trucks, buses, and motorcycles. The noise analysis will look at the vehicle noise contribution and accumulation. Len was concerned about identifying the additional noise from the potential bus capacity increase from certain alternatives, and how the noise data will compare additional noise from increased bus capacity with noise from the current bus capacity.
- Mitch Wasserman, City of Clyde Hill, discussed his concern over the potential noise effects on Clyde Hill residents uphill (500 feet) from SR-520 and asked that this be addressed. Michael Minor reported that he will look outside of the 500-foot study area boundary. Michael stated that the problem with going beyond 500 feet is that the atmosphere and geography do strange things to sound, making mitigation difficult. He plans on monitoring in selected locations to help characterize these issues. He will be conducting all the modeling with and without arterial roadways, setting SR-520 as the major noise source. 500 feet is a general boundary, and the noise monitoring will be done beyond this area.
- Ann Martin, King County, asked if the modeling shows additional traffic on adjoining arterials within one-quarter to one mile and what kind of noise analysis would be done for the arterial traffic. Ann pointed out that the noise analysis is valuable information for comparing alternatives.

Visual Quality, Land Use and Economics

Mike Behn, CH2M Hill, represented the work done for the visual quality, as well as the land use and economics section of the EIS impact methodology. The study area will consist of views from SR-520 and toward SR-520. The project team will identify key views, viewer groups, and viewsheds. There will be simulations done for selected viewpoints. The land use and economics study area will be 500 feet from the proposed alternatives and one quarter mile from proposed BRT stations. The project team will examine the existing land uses based on field-verified King County tax assessor data and then identify current and 30-year economic data from the Puget Sound Regional Council.

Discussion yielded the following points and questions:

- Eric Chipps, City of Seattle, offered his assistance with identifying viewpoint locations in the City of Seattle. He suggested that the project team be consistent with modeling.
- Terry Swanson, Ecology, stated that shoreline views would be an issue for the Shoreline Management Act (SMA), among other programs.
- Jonathan Freedman, EPA, asked if the project would be using the same PSRC data sets that were done for the I-405 project (pre-1998 model with population, employment and land use figures that is planned to be online later this year). Jonathan requested that the cumulative impacts be coordinated. Peter Beaulieu, PSRC, stated that the project may use this data for the affected environment, but PSRC has not yet updated the analysis.
- Ann Martin, King County, asked whether they would be using the most up-to-date information. Lorie Parker reaffirmed that they will use the most current, available modeling. Ann requested that the indirect impacts from other modes, besides BRT and stations, be analyzed.
- Bernard van de Kamp, City of Bellevue, asked how they would identify displacements.
- Peter Beaulieu, PSRC, asked the project to take special consideration of what are the real world indirect impacts of the no-action alternative and include this in the analysis. The modeling should differentiate as appropriate under the eight Regional Framework Policies of VISION 2020.

Public Services, Utilities, Relocations, Social, Recreation, and Section 4(f)/6(f) Resources Evaluation

Mike Behn, CH2M Hill, represented the public services, utilities, relocations, and social sections of the EIS methodology.

The public services and utilities impact methodologies study area will include the utilities in direct conflict with the alternatives, including service providers that cross SR-520 or associated improvements. Examples of services that will be included are: police, fire, cable, etc. The public services and utilities analysis will include data collected from design teams, comprehensive plans, and service providers.

The relocations section study area would include displacements from the alternatives footprint and would seek relocation areas at least one mile from SR-520. Preparation would be in coordination with land use, economics and social analyses. The project team has looked at the numbers, but has not identified the relocations qualitatively. The social section summarizes a variety of analyses to describe effects to neighborhoods. The social impacts analysis looks at neighborhoods directly adjacent to SR-520.

The recreation impact methodology consists of a study area 500 feet from proposed alternatives. The analysis includes public and private recreational facilities. The Section 4 (f)/6(f) evaluation

study area is based on recreation, cultural resources, and vegetation and wildlife analyses study areas. This evaluation will be a part of the EIS appendix. Section 4(f) includes public recreational facilities, historic properties, and wildlife/waterfowl refuges. Section 6(f) relates to park facilities funded through the U.S. Land and Water Conservation Funds Act.

The following questions and points were brought up at this time:

- Mike Grady, NMFS, suggested that the University of Washington and State of Washington be added to the agencies section.
- Len Newstrum, Town of Yarrow Point, questioned whether the recreation analysis will include the entire, 500-foot area in the study.
- Terry Swanson, Ecology, pointed out that the Shoreline Management Act requires evaluating impact on recreation.

Cultural Resources

Anne Sienko, CH2M Hill, was available to answer general cultural resource impact methodology questions, although Jim Bard, CH2M Hill, will conduct the cultural resource EIS analysis. The cultural resource study area will include the area of potential effect including the alternative's footprint and buffer area (200 to 300 feet from footprint). The project team will do a gross-level data collection and then field reconnaissance for archaeological and historical resources. They will analyze the age of resources and whether they would be considered historic. This work will be done in conjunction with area tribes.

The cultural resources discussion yielded the following questions and points:

- Ann Martin, King County, asked whether any cultural resource areas are in the minimum footprint area and would be disturbed by construction. Ann discussed how the County's GIS projections of cultural resources might be of use for the Trans-Lake Washington project.
- Mike Grady, NMFS, asked that WSDOT consider consultation with tribal staff and that they have separate meetings with tribal council members for the Trans-Lake Washington project. Mike clarified that cultural resources include tribal fishing areas. Jim Leonard, FHWA, pointed out that they have a formal way of requesting consultation.
- Jonathan Freedman, U.S. EPA, clarified that the exact geographical locations of cultural/archaeological resources will not be published.

Geology and Soils, Hazardous Materials, and Energy

Anne Sienko, CH2M Hill, was available to answer general geology and soils, hazardous materials, and energy impact methodology questions, although Karen Dawson, CH2M Hill, will be conducting the geology and soils EIS analysis; Marian Allen-McDermott, CH2M Hill, will be leading the hazardous materials EIS analysis; and Lisa Fall, CH2M Hill, will be doing the energy EIS analysis.

The geology and soils impact methodology includes the proposed footprints for the alternatives and surrounding slopes for the study area. They will conduct subsurface explorations and geologic field reconnaissance to supplement the existing data.

The hazardous material impact methodology study area consists of the new right-of-way and the area a quarter mile from the proposed alternatives. A windshield survey would be done from public access areas to confirm data, and there would be no right-of-entry to properties acquired.

The energy section will be done in a comparative style. The energy impact methodology analysis would include the SR-520 corridor, as defined by transportation analysis. The project team plans on comparing energy consumption between alternatives qualitatively, but will provide a detailed quantification of energy consumed.

Discussion at this time yielded the following input:

- Ann Martin, King County, asked if there would be any attempt to analyze the amount of energy consumed to transport/carry a person.
- Len Newstrum, Town of Yarrow Point, requested that the project look at the change in the energy system for the whole corridor as a region.

Environmental Justice

Mark Assam, CH2M Hill, will be analyzing the environmental justice impacts. Mark will conduct this analysis by looking at all the other information and re-examining it from an environmental justice perspective. Mark will map locations of minority and low-income populations within one quarter mile of SR-520 and review all of the other analyses to determine high and adverse effects.

The following questions and points were brought up at this time:

- Jonathan Freedman, U.S. EPA, questioned whether the Trans-Lake Washington project would use the guiding plans and policies from the EPA. Mark Assam, CH2M Hill, stated he will use the WSDOT guidelines for analysis, as this is what is normally done for these types of projects.

- Peter Beaulieu, PSRC, asked how a particular environmental element in the study area is defined. Lorie Parker explained that an environmental element in a report is a segment, not a geographical description. The project team will be looking at indirect and cumulative effects on populations.

General Questions and Input:

- Terry Swanson, Ecology, asked where the project is from a concurrence point perspective.
- Ann Martin, King County, asked whether a preferred alternative would go into this draft or be done as a separate concurrence or a concurrence-only element. Lorie Parker stated that the new merger agreement does not require concurrence on the preliminary preferred alternative.. She reiterated that there will be future discussions on this. She said at the point when the draft EIS is released, there will be a preliminary preferred alternative.
- Jonathan Freedman, EPA, asked how soon before publication of the DEIS will the project team know the preferred alternative. He also asked how the project committees will be brought into the selection process of the preferred alternative. He suggested that the Trans-Lake Washington project avoid problems experienced by the I-405 project with bringing in another alternative (3). Les Rubstello explained that there would have to be parallel approval from both the Executive Committee and the agencies on the preferred alternative. Jonathan stated that the simultaneous approval did not happen with the I-405 project.
- Jim Leonard, FHWA, pointed out that the FTA and the FHWA own the document and would sign the front page. He said that FHWA and FTA would never push an alternative contrary to what the Executive Committee recommends.
- Mike Grady, NMFS, is concerned that the Executive Committee needs agency membership. He said the Executive Committee structure is awkward, and it is uncomfortable that the agencies are not directly there to explain their requirements and input. Pat Serie, EnviroIssues, explained that the Technical Committee was set up to provide regulatory advice to the Executive Committee and the Executive Committee formulates its recommendations from the other committees' input. The team will structure opportunities for greater interaction with the Executive Committee.
- Ann Martin, King County, asked given the state and county structuring of transportation and the fact that alternatives are combinations of modes (with different funding structures), how will the project team be able to make a commitment on the decision. She would also like to know how the Executive Committee makes decisions and deals with transit. She expressed concern with the various pieces on the funding ballot and wondered how the project will deal with certain portions not getting funding, especially for mega-projects. This could alter the entire transit system. Les Rubstello clarified that transit is not mitigation for the highway, but integral to the project definition.
- Terry Swanson, Ecology, stated that she is concerned that the agencies will not concur with the Executive Committee decisions and that the setup is politically awkward. It may

pit the agencies against the Executive Committee. Jonathan Freedman, EPA, noted the awkwardness of the I-405 project preferred alternative decision and how the I-405 project team had not recognized the work that had been done, resulting in disorganization and the loss of the benefit of the agencies' information.

- Mike Grady, NMFS, discussed the light rail or HCT components of the Executive Committee's January 30 recommendations and the decision to not preclude the future addition of HCT on SR-520. HCT or light rail would not be considered a mitigation component, but rather a project element.

Transportation

Michael Horntvedt, CH2M Hill, led the discussion on the transportation impact methodology. His transportation analysis has already begun. The transportation impact methodology study area includes the freeway and the local intersections on: I-5 (between NE 45th and the I-90 Collector Distributor ramps), the entire SR-520 corridor (between I-5 and Avondale/Redmond Way), and I-405 (between NE 70th and NE 4th). The transportation analysis will assess impacts for regional highways, local roadways, parking, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, transit service, and freight movement. A navigation study has already been done with the US Coast Guard.

Transportation impact methodology discussion included the following questions and points:

- Len Newstrum, Town of Yarrow Point, discussed the accommodation of the long-term future inclusion of HCT on SR-520. The accommodations will vary for alternatives, and he recommends having a degree of planning, so that the designers can make accommodations for the regional plan.
- Lorie Parker pointed out that the DEIS will include only the known projects with secured funding in the direct impact analysis. Other projects will be included in separate sections. This means that the team will not show build scenarios with light rail on I-90 because it is not funded.
- Ann Martin, King County, discussed the impacts, demand analysis and effects of changing the conditions on the corridor. For example, changing the metering on one corridor might induce demand on another corridor. She is concerned that this method of analysis would create false demand data. She requested the project take into consideration the dampening effect on demand and the direct impacts on noise levels and air quality.
- Len Newstrum, Town of Hunts Point, asked to look at various scenarios of other projects not advancing.
- Bernard van de Kamp, City of Bellevue, asked whether the transportation impact methodology would address the I-405 / SR-520 interchange and added downtown Bellevue traffic. Michael Horntvedt said this type of analysis would be included in the environmental consequences section and not in the cumulative impacts section. The project is fully aware of the Access Downtown project in Bellevue, and they will include

this study and show the impacts on I-405. Bernard asked what portions would be picked up by each project if I-405 and SR-520 are expanded, such as whom would pay for HOV connector ramps. Les Rubstello responded that the EIS would show the entire buildout, including I-405 widened enough to put ramps in the middle, and that costs would be assigned to the various projects at a later date.

- Eric Chipps, City of Seattle, wanted more information on pricing and how this would be done as an integral part of each alternative and as a separate TDM program. Eric asked if vanpool usage and park and ride area impacts would be addressed, such as identifying quantifiable impacts on transit capacity. He questioned how the project would assess the impacts resulting from various alternatives. Lorie Parker explained that TDM would be a component of alternatives and a portion of project description. She said the project will be analyzing the proposed TDM program. Eric asked if the project would be choosing a 10% increase as the threshold value on the intersections, and he questioned the usefulness of that threshold. He said there might be another way to look at the whole intersection. He asked the team to consider the effects on pedestrian/bicycle facilities around the University of Washington, being sure to identify impacts to high pedestrian use intersections and bicycle intersections.
- Terry Marpert, City of Redmond, would like to have local traffic impacts information, as stated on page 5 of the EIS impact methodology. He would particularly like to have detailed engineering information on direct ramp effects and traffic operations in the area. He asked if the project team could make the 4-lane alternative, TDM, and pricing system work.
- Peter Beaulieu, PSRC, discussed how the I-405 project looked at pricing on a regional level and that taking pricing to the Executive Committee at a corridor level is not right. He stated that transit (page 6) should be quantitatively looked at and discussed. He would like transit to be done in a viable manner so that people can use this amenity. He said transit is integral and shouldn't be voted on; it is not a monitoring system. He asked what does each alternative do in terms of transit reliability, attractiveness, and mode shift, especially during the peak period.
- Mitch Wasserman, City of Clyde Hill, requested that the model look at which communities are generating traffic into other communities.

PRESENTATION ON THE TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

John Shadoff and Jean Mabry, WSDOT, presented current Transportation Demand Management (TDM) analyses, based on the recently compiled draft *Transportation Demand Management Element Definition & Evaluation Report,* which was distributed to the Technical Committee members and participants. This report and presentation are available on the Trans-Lake Washington project web site under the April 10 Technical Committee meeting materials. Comments concerning the draft TDM program report and analysis should be sent by May 3, 2002.

TDM is a term applied to a broad range of actions and strategies that support and increase efficiency of the transportation system by reducing or changing travel demand on the system. Key findings of background work were that the corridor TDM strategies should focus on amplifying existing regional, sub-area or local programs to address the specific problems and needs of the SR-520 corridor. The SR-520 corridor has a much higher degree of commute trips than others, especially at the mid-point of the bridges. TDM increases person-throughput and enhances other mobility actions in the corridor by increasing the use of high occupancy vehicles (HOVs).

Key TDM findings were that the 4-lane alternative would present both the greatest need for TDM and the greatest challenge. There are seven areas that make up the majority of origins and destinations for SR-520 trips and should be the focus of expanded TDM aimed at affecting those trips. The strategies within the recommended TDM program are based on incentives and information. Promotions and disincentives could be considered in order to increase the effectiveness of the program. An aggressive TDM program is necessary to help achieve HOV levels assumed by Puget Sound Regional Council's model. They will look at which point in the TDM program would lessen the amount of lanes for the alternatives.

A TDM program goal is to reduce the growth rate of Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) in the SR-520 corridor overall by shifting SOV travel to HOV modes and eliminating trips or shortening local trips. The TDM program aims to increase person throughput on the bridge by shifting SOV travel to HOV modes and shifting trips out of peaks. The basis of the TDM program would be built from interlocal agreements to reduce SOV trips and would focus on accountability and flexibility. The project team will be using a tiered approach for investing in TDM, with the highest investment for the 4-lane alternative, a lower investment for the 6-lane alternative, and an even lower investment for the 8-lane alternative.

Major Elements of Recommended TDM Program

There are five major TDM elements, including: public information, education and promotion; vanpool programs; employer-based programs; land use as TDM; and other miscellaneous programs. The TDM program will have commuter incentive-based strategies focused on seven target areas. They will study corridor-focused rideshare programs and adding more vanpools. The employer-based element will look at telecommuting and adjusting commuting hours, commute trip reduction (CTR) associations, adding new associations, and parking cash programs for employers. The TDM as land use component explores changing zoning where possible to mixed use and tax incentives for developers.

Estimating the effectiveness of the TDM program is difficult and is not an exact science. The project team plans on rating TDM program effectiveness by looking at model assumptions, available resources (TDM guide for planners, CTR data, vanpool studies, etc.), the degree to which the target is met/numbers achieved, and the impacts on trip-making in the corridor.

The following questions and points were brought up during the TDM discussion:

- Ann Martin, King County, would like to have the project phased by transportation choice. She said this was also brought up for the I-405 project. One of the reasons that she was asking WSDOT and FHWA to consider a phased approach is that they don't know how transportation modes will perform in the future. While the project is making decisions right now, they may find 10-15 years from now that these decisions should not have been made. She postulated that TDM and BRT may solve the mobility problem, without adding all the lanes.
- Peter Beaulieu, PSRC, requested that the table with $3 million show where there is money overlapping with the I-405 project. He asked if it's really true that there will be an interest in the cost per trip perspective. When the modeling is completed the mode split would work, and whatever surrogates are in the model should show what modes are split.
- Terry Marpert, City of Redmond, asked why there is limited TDM funding compared to the I-405 project. He would like more TDM funding, so that highly visible TDM performance is possible.
- Jonathan Freedman, EPA, requested that non-construction options be substituted for environmental impacts. He noted that the TDM expenditures being shown would not allow you to drop the 8-lane or 6-lane alternatives. He asked what are the possibilities with parking and land use incentives. Jean Mabry pointed out that there would be a TDM disincentive for the 8-lane alternative, due to it being harder to capture HOV lane users with the additional general purpose capacity.
- Ann Martin, King County, would like carpool lanes specifically described in strategies, since cars are the largest capital investments in the region.
- Bernard van de Kamp, City of Bellevue, asked whether this meeting is looking for a collective yes or no on the TDM program. Pat Serie clarified that the Technical Committee will meet again to discuss the TDM program. The Technical Committee members are to send in their comments by April 19. Bernard would like the TDM program to be different than the I-405 project's TDM program, which focuses on vanpools and telecommuting. The SR-520 corridor has a much stronger transit and HCT potential that should be emphasized over vanpool incentives. There is trouble with vanpool participation in Bellevue, while transit ridership has been increasing.
- Len Newstrum, Town of Yarrow Point, pointed out the potential van leasing opportunities. He requested that the TDM cost data include the cost of lost tax money from TDM tax breaks.

NEXT STEPS

The project team will be scheduling another Technical Committee meeting at the end of May to go over the indirect and cumulative effects of the EIS impact methodologies, TDM program, and pricing. There will be Advisory and Executive Committee meetings scheduled immediately after the Technical Committee in the beginning of June. There will be follow-up sessions scheduled to discuss the air quality impact methodology, traffic and transportation impact methodology, and the concurrence points and indirect effects with agencies. Comments concerning the EIS impact methodology should be submitted to Lorie Parker by April 24 and comments for the TDM program to Jean Mabry or John Shadoff, WSDOT, by May 3. Lorie Parker, CH2M Hill, will provide a comment matrix, explaining what was and was not added in the EIS impact methodology before the next Technical Committee meeting. The project team will be working on refining the EIS impact methodology for the environmental analysis and will share this progress.

ACTION ITEMS

- Return comments to Lorie Parker, CH2M Hill, on EIS impact methodology by April 24 and on the TDM program to Jean Mabry or John Shadoff, WSDOT, by May 3.
- Provide the full TDM program comments in a document for the Committees.
- Schedule follow-up sessions on air quality impact methodology, traffic and transportation impact methodology, concurrence process and indirect effects, and if indicated by comments, the TDM program.

MEETING HANDOUTS

- Agenda
- Trans-Lake Washington Project EIS Methodology Report- DRAFT 4/3/02
- Presentation on EIS Methodology Reports
- Resulting List of Executive Committee Recommendations from January 30, 2002
- Transportation Demand Management Element Definition and Evaluation Report
- Presentation on the Recommended Transportation Demand Management Program
- Comment from City of Seattle Councilmember, Richard Conlin, from the January 30, 2002 Executive Committee Meeting
- Trans-Lake TDM Program Strategies that Might be Expanded and/or Added sheet
- Summary of Trans-Lake Washington TDM and Land Use Effectiveness Review and Enhancement

MEETING ATTENDEES

Technical Committee Members

Present	Name		ORGANIZATION
X	Bowman	Jennifer	Federal Transit Administration
	Brooks	Allyson	Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation
	Conrad	Richard	City of Mercer Island
X	Cushman	King	Puget Sound Regional Council (Peter Beaulieu)
	Dewey	Peter	University of Washington
	Fisher	Larry	Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
X	Freedman	Jonathan	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
X	Godfrey	Dave	City of Kirkland
X	Grady	Mike	National Marine Fisheries Service
	Kennedy	Jack	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
	Kennedy	Steve	Sound Transit
	Kenny	Ann	Washington Department of Ecology
X	Kircher	Dave	Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (Paul Carr)
X	Leonard	Jim	Federal Highway Administration
X	Marpert	Terry	City of Redmond
X	Martin	Ann	King County Department of Transportation
X	Newstrum	Len	Town of Yarrow Point
	Rave	Krista	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
	Pratt	Austin	U.S. Coast Guard, 13th District
X	Sanchez	Susan	City of Seattle (Eric Chipps)
X	Schulze	Doug	City of Medina
X	Sparrman	Goran	City of Bellevue (Bernard van de Kamp)
X	Sullivan	Maureen	WSDOT – NW Region
X	Swanson	Terry	Washington Department of Ecology
X	Teachout	Emily	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
X	Wasserman	Mitch	City of Clyde Hill
	Willis	Joe	Town of Hunts Point

Other attendees

Project Team
Les Rubstello, WSDOT
Barbara Gilliland, Sound Transit
Jeff Peacock, Parametrix
Lorie Parker, CH2M Hill
Anne Sienko, CH2M Hill
Mike Behn, CH2M Hill
Bob Swope, CH2M Hill
Mary Beth Yansura, CH2M Hill

Michael Horntvedt, CH2M Hill
Margaret Clancy, Parametrix
Jenna Friebel, Parametrix
Don Weitkamp, Parametrix
Susan Wessman, Parametrix
Jane Farquharson, PSTC
John Shadoff, WSDOT
Jean Mabry, WSDOT
Michael Minor, Minor and Associates
Pat Serie, EnviroIssues
Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues
Jennifer Cannon, EnviroIssues

JJC